



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

BOOK REVIEWS

---

INTOLERANCE IN THE REIGN OF ELIZABETH, QUEEN OF ENGLAND. ARTHUR J. KLEIN. The Houghton Mifflin Co. 1917. Pp. xii, 218. \$2.00.

No higher praise can be given to this able historical study than to say that it recalls and ranks with Mr. Usher's *Reconstruction of the English Church*. That within a few years two works of such distinction, dealing with technical features of English Church history, should have come from America, augurs well for the mutual understanding which exists between the two nations already allied by blood and civilization, and now knit closer by coöperation in a common and sacred cause.

"Intolerance," says the author, "is essentially a social phenomenon based upon the group-conception of 'rightness'; and attention is called to the fact that

"there is also a field worth investigating in the groups of non-religious intolerance. A very interesting book, or series of books, even more useful than much that has been written about religious intolerance, might be compiled by some one who turned his attention to the intolerance of medicine, of law, and of etiquette" (pp. 2, 4).

There is, however, this difference between the religious and the secular field, that on the former the conception of a fixed deposit of faith, which can neither be taken from nor added to, lies to hand. Given this premiss, there is a logical though not an ethical or a positive case for intolerance; while, on the latter, the content of the science or usage in question is obviously a variable quantity; so that intolerance, even if, like loss, it is "common to the race," is an inconsistency. On both, there are undoubtedly points of view which, though they are not our own, we may reasonably wish to see represented, because, while their predominance might be mischievous, they have a value as counter-balancing forces in the sum of thought and things. Only so can we secure

"the ultimate triumph of that sounder principle of national unity which recognizes the element of *variety* in a harmonious whole — a principle which only the modern world has realized" (p. 190).

We shall fail to understand the Reformation unless we realize how widely mediæval Catholicism differed from modern. The Reformation synchronized with, and to a great extent occasioned, the transformation of Catholicism into Romanism—the words are used in a historical, not in a controversial sense. What is meant is that before Luther the Western Church stood for Western Christianity, and that since Luther it has stood for Latin or Roman. There is all the difference in the world between the two. *La tradizione son' io*, said Pius IX; and no one dared to dispute the oracle. Had Clement VII or Leo X advanced the pretension, the stones would have cried out. For the Papacy was not then, as it has since become, the centre and sum of Catholicism. An important school of canonists sat loose to it, and the Great Schism had been an object-lesson. It had shown that, whatever the Pope might be theologically—that was a question for theologians—the Church could dispense with him in fact. And to a Catholic of the sixteenth century the Royal Supremacy was not the flat heresy that it is to the modern Romanist. In the Middle Ages two supremacies, the Royal and the Papal, struggled in the Church's womb.

A strong king was master in his own house; a strong Pope disputed his mastery; in ordinary times a *modus vivendi* was arrived at. But Henry VIII, high-handed as he was, could not have carried the nation with him had the Supreme Headship of the sovereign been as novel in fact as it was in name. The Reformation did not effect a revolution; it dissolved a partnership. The Pope was excluded from the government of the Reformed, the civil power from that of the un-reformed, churches. The latter process was gradual, and remained incomplete till our own day.

One notable result of these controversies was the heightening of the theological temperature. Both among Catholics and Protestants fanaticism overflowed its bounds; in England, happily, less than elsewhere, owing to the political forces at work in the religious settlement. The features of the English Church which are most displeasing to bigots—her distrust of enthusiasm and of extremes, her non-committal policy, what has been called her “quiet worldliness”—are not of post-Reformation origin; they are a direct inheritance from the secularized and sectarian temper of the Mediæval Church.

The Elizabethan settlement of religion, like the Revolution settlement of the succession (1688), which in many respects it resembled, was precarious for more than a generation. In each case the permanence of the new order seemed uncertain, and to whichever

side men attached themselves, they kept a foot in the opposite camp. At Elizabeth's accession there was an energetic Protestant minority, whose numbers and zeal had been increased by its Marian persecution, and a small but equally energetic Catholic minority whose hopes centred in the Queen of Scots; but the great majority of the people stood between the two. They resembled the nations of whom we read that "they feared the Lord but served their graven images." They were neither convinced Catholics nor convinced Protestants, but both, or neither, or something between the two. They were not Papists; the Papacy bulked less in Pre- than in Post-Reformation Catholicism; and they disliked, as Englishmen to this day dislike, religious change. The controversies of the age did not interest them. "These be not matters for burning," was their phrase. Among the educated the Queen's attitude, which was that of a somewhat detached outsider, was common. "Gentlemen," says Selden, "have ever been more temperate in their religion than the common people, as having more reason — the others running in a hurry."

The daughter of Anne Boleyn could not afford to be a Papist; and the sheer wickedness of the Counter-Reformation shocked her. She refused to admit Bonner to her presence — a fact which goes far to discredit the attempt made by later writers to whitewash him; and when, after the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, she and her court received the French envoy in mourning, there is no reason to question her abhorrence of that great crime. But she was a lukewarm Protestant. Temperamentally she had neither understanding nor sympathy with fanaticism; as a ruler, she detested sedition; and she believed, not without reason, that the more extreme forms of Protestantism stood for both. The formularies of the English Church were deliberately framed to include non-Papal Catholics. It was from circumstances, not from choice, that the Queen became the champion of the Protestant cause. Both she and the country were carried further and faster in this direction than she had either wished or intended, by the association of ideas which was not at first obvious, and by the course of events, which could not be foreseen. Henry VIII's Catholicism without the Pope had broken down in the clash of conflicting world-forces, and Europe fell into two hostile camps, in one or other of which men and nations had to take their stand.

In her first year she had to nominate twenty-five bishops. There were difficulties — legal, for many of the sees were not legally vacant, and moral, because the best men refused the position. The per-

secuting Marian bishops were out of the question. Men of the type of Bernard Gilpin, whom Mr. Gladstone used to quote as an illustration of the continuity of English religion — he had been ordained under Henry VIII, and remained undisturbed under Edward, Mary, and Elizabeth — held back. The more religious Protestants, unfortunately, scrupled at the ceremonies and habits which Calvin had allowed as *tolerabiles ineptiae*, and which it was necessary to retain from political motives. The government had to fall back upon lesser men. Parker and Jewel, who were the best of them and were chosen against their will, scarcely inspire enthusiasm; the greater number deserved the contempt in which they were generally held. They were exiles whom persecution had made persecutors; their principles were lax and their standards low. Some were openly scandalous. Sandys, Archbishop of York, was found *in flagrante delicto* with the wife of a tavern-keeper; Middleton, who was subsequently deprived for incontinence, was what has been euphemistically described as “a Christian with two wives”; Aylmer was “a brawler, greedy of filthy lucre”; Barlow, Parker’s consecrator, a bishop of *opera bouffe*. The epitaph on Mrs. Barlow, whose five daughters married respectively an Archbishop of York, and the Bishops of Winchester, Hereford, Lincoln, and Lichfield, is worth quoting:

Hic Agathae tumulus; Barloi praesulis, inde  
 Exulis, inde iterum praesulis uxor erat.  
 Prole beata fuit: plena annis quinque suarum  
 Praesulibus vidit, praesulis ipsa, datas.

One could not take such an episcopate seriously; it was a thing for a shrug or a sneer. No one knew this better than Elizabeth. Her support of the bishops was political; they were useful tools. Her opposition to Puritanism, as to Popery, was not religious. To suppose her zealous for episcopacy or for the liturgy is to misread her: a child of the Renaissance, she “cared for none of these things.” Her anti-Puritan policy was matter of hard, cold calculation. The Reformation had gone to the outside limit of safety; a little, a very little, more and the nation would have been estranged. Elizabeth was better aware of this than her advisers; of all our sovereigns she was the most purely English and gauged most accurately the English mind. It was not till the half-French Stuarts associated Puritanism with Parliamentary as opposed to personal government that Puritanism became temporarily popular. In the Queen’s time it was an eccentricity; and there was less patience then than now with

eccentricities, particularly when they were, or might easily become, sources of public danger. Had Elizabeth broken openly and completely with the old religious order, the unity of the nation would have been destroyed. Her necessarily tentative and conservative policy has had lasting consequences, and has left as its legacy not a few of the controversies which divide the Church of our own time.

The Catholic question was as urgent as the Puritan. Professor Klein's parallel between this problem and that presented by anarchism today is ingenious:

"Perhaps no closer comparison of the English governmental attitude towards Catholics can be made than with the attitude of established government towards anarchistic opinion in our own time. The attitude is distinctly one of suspicion and supervision, but also one of tolerance and abstinence from active interference, except when the expression of opinion becomes clearly destructive of existing institutions or manifests itself in acts of violence" (p. 50).

It is probable that this expresses the Queen's intention. It was certainly that of Bancroft. But circumstances were too much for both Queen and Bishop; on each side passion and prejudice ran too high. The English Catholics were divided into two sections. The verdict of the majority of them on the Reformation was, *Fieri non debuit; factum valet*. All they asked for was to stand outside. But there was a minority, small but restlessly energetic and backed by Spain and Rome, which, regarding Catholicism primarily as a polity, would be content with nothing short of its forcible restoration, and held all means to this end lawful — rebellion, assassination, the calling in of foreign armies, the subjection of their country to alien rule. The *Letters and Memorials of Cardinal Allen* showed the extent to which the highest authorities in the Church were committed to plots whose objects were treasonable and whose methods were murderous.<sup>1</sup> This was the case for the Penal Laws. Some such legislation, Lingard admits, was a necessity.<sup>2</sup> Like the Coercion Acts of a later day, they were a hateful necessity. All exceptional legislation is hateful. But there are circumstances under which it becomes imperative in self-defence.

The Government, whatever its intentions, failed to a greater extent than Professor Klein admits, to distinguish between the moderate or religious, and the extreme or political, Catholics. Cuthbert Mayne was a type of the first, Robert Parsons of the

<sup>1</sup> Edinburgh Review, October, 1883.

<sup>2</sup> History of England, viii, 150. Life, by Haile and Bonney, 27.

second; and Mayne suffered while Parsons went free. Bancroft's merit was that he made a real attempt at discrimination, and that he would have put the former class within the law. In this, for a bishop, he was greatly in advance of his time. Nor, if his immediate motive was political, is it unreasonable to see also in his action a higher statesmanship, an endeavor to make the better and more reasonable elements in Catholicism prevail. At some personal risk he intervened in the domestic dissensions of the Catholic body, supporting the secular clergy against the Jesuits and their creature the arch-priest Blackwell, and facilitating the appeal of the former to Rome. Could the question have been settled in England, it might have been brought to a satisfactory issue. But Rome was the key to the position; and Rome, as always, took not the religious but the political—and the wrong political—side. Clement VIII trusted to schemers who plotted treason, to conspirators who hatched murder, to visionaries who dreamed dreams. The unfortunate English Catholics paid the penalty. The Pope did not, he said, desire toleration for them; toleration would destroy their faith. At home the Jesuits controlled the funds, and the ecclesiastical machine was at their disposal. The Appellants had not the courage to resist them; and though no more than a fraction of the laity was with the extreme party, the stronger wills carried the day. The Concordat controversy in France under Pius X is a modern parallel. In England it was not, however, till the Gunpowder Plot had shocked the conscience and shaken the nerve of the country, that the prospect of accommodation finally disappeared. *Delicta majorum immeritus lues*. The world-war may be as disastrous for French Catholicism as the Plot was for English; the wise and moderate Benedict XV may pay the penalty for his predecessor's sin.

Bancroft was a link between the Elizabethan and the Stuart periods, dying Nov. 10, 1610. Whitgift's last words had been "*Pro Ecclesia Dei!*" None such are reported of his successor, nor would they have been in keeping with his temper. He was neither a saint nor saintly. But, so far as human judgment can measure it, the best service to the Church and to religion has not been done by saints, nor even by distinctly religious-minded men. Saints have, as a rule, left behind them a legacy of questions, to which those who were not saints have been hard pressed to find a solution, and have seldom succeeded in finding one on purely religious ground or by purely religious means. And at critical times the quiet virtues which we associate, perhaps too exclusively, with religion,

fall into the background. There is not time to cultivate them. The rough work of the world, the cutting and carving of its raw material into shape, is done by rough instruments; not by pietists but by elemental men. No idealizing will transform Bancroft into any clerical type with which we are familiar; we cannot place him in the world of modern religious party—with its shibboleths, its abstractions, its symbols. A man of action, he concerned himself neither with names nor notions, but with concrete interests and tangible things. His work was taken over by men of narrower outlook and less moderate temper—and spoiled in the taking. He had learned to be “supple in things immaterial”; had he stood in Laud’s place at Charles’ elbow, the royal blood would not have stained the scaffold of Whitehall. He left a tradition at Lambeth which is not extinct, and whose extinction would be a misfortune. It is the voice not of Laud but of Bancroft that speaks to this day from St. Augustine’s chair. Hence the ill-disguised irritation of enthusiasts, the dissatisfaction of men of curious and speculative temper, and the general assent of that average, if neither very spiritual, very enlightened, nor very interesting, opinion which is the strength of Churches, and on which, in the last resort, society, religious and secular, as we know it, rests.

ALFRED FAWKES.

ASHBY ST. LEDGERS, RUGBY, ENGLAND.

LA CONTROVERSE DE MARTIN MARPRELATE, 1588–1590: EPISODE DE L’HISTOIRE LITTÉRAIRE DU PURITANISME SOUS ELIZABETH. G. BONNARD, Docteur ès Lettres. Genève. A. Julien. 1916. Pp. xv, 237. 4 fr.

The religious life of England under Elizabeth has received much recent illumination. The careful studies of Roman Catholic conditions, some of which have been reviewed in these pages, have enlarged, through the work of Catholic and Protestant scholars alike, our knowledge of the fate of the Roman obedience and of its adherents. An American student, Roland G. Usher, has discussed the Presbyterian Movement under Elizabeth, the Reconstruction, chiefly by Richard Bancroft, of the English Church, and the work of the High Commission. Another American scholar, Champlin Burrage, has thrown much light on the early English Dissenters. W. H. Frere has made accessible a number of rare Puritan manifestos. We are getting to know the facts, the persons, and the influences of religious England in the significant Elizabethan age more minutely and more accurately.